



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/943,356 10/01/97 CHARI

S MNFRAME.033A

LM02/0427

KNOBBE MARTENS  
OLSON & BEAR  
620 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE  
SIXTEENTH FLOOR  
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660-8016

EXAMINER

NA.I.T.A.R.S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2758

DATE MAILED:

04/27/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
08/943,356

Applicant(s)

Charl et al.

Examiner

Saleh Najjar

Group Art Unit

2758



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 15, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 7, 15, 18

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

1. This action is responsive to the preliminary amendment filed on February 15, 2000. Claims 1, 11, 20, and 23 were amended. Claims 1-38 are pending examination. Claims 1-38 represent a method directed toward managing computer system alerts.

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-18, 20-27, 33-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dev et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,751,933.

Dev teaches the invention as claimed including a system for determining the status of entities in a computer network (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Dev teaches a method of monitoring alerts regarding the status of components in a computer, comprising the acts of:

receiving a plurality of unfiltered alerts, said alerts providing status information about different components in the computer (see figs. 1-4; col. 7, lines 25-30, Dev discloses receiving significant events from network devices at the virtual network machine); and

allowing the user to selectively disable a future display of one or more of said alerts to the user, and recording said status information associated with said disabled alerts in a storage medium (see col. 8-10, Dev discloses that the user may use a filtering criteria to disable the display of events such as unspecifying a model type event display).

As per claim 2, Dev teaches a method of monitoring alerts regarding the status of components in a computer as in claim 1 above, including storing whether each of said alerts is disabled or enabled to be displayed to the user in a plurality of variables (see col. 8, Dev discloses that a filtering criteria can be utilized by the user to adjust the threshold of the severity of the event condition so that the event is not displayed).

As to claim 3, Dev teaches a method of monitoring alerts regarding the status of components in a computer, including storing information about said disabled alerts "events" in said storage medium at a user computer (see col. 8, Dev discloses that all events are logged).

As to claim 5, Dev teaches a method of monitoring alerts regarding the status of components in a computer, including, generating a user interface which allows a user to select one or more of said alerts to be displayed to the user by providing a description of said alerts (see fig. 10; col. 14-15, Dev discloses a user graphical interface which allows a user to display different views showing status information).

As to claims 6-7, and 33, Dev teaches a method of monitoring alerts regarding the status of components in a computer as in the claims above, wherein said user interface enables said selected alerts to be displayed to the user in response to an enable command by the user, or disable said selected alerts from being displayed to the user in response to a disable command by the user (see col. 8, Dev discloses that a user may specify different filtering techniques to specify minimum event severity for which events may be displayed).

As to claims 8-9, Dev teaches a method of monitoring alerts regarding the status of components in a computer as in the claims above, further including displaying said enabled alerts notification window to the user and displaying the name of a component associated with one of said alerts (see figs. 9-10).

Claims 11-12 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-2 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claim 13, Dev teaches wherein said computer network performs simple network management protocol SNMP transactions (see col. 4).

As to claims 14-17, Dev teaches the claimed limitation wherein said first code contains an index; wherein said status module uses said index to identify said user-friendly display message; wherein said index is predefined by a management information base; wherein said management information associates information about said component with said index; wherein said status module uses said information about said component from said management information base to generate said user-friendly display message (see figs. 1-10; col. 4-6; Dev discloses that different network devices are represented by virtual software models at the management console and events received by the management console are correlated with the virtual model to display the notification and description of events regarding network devices).

As to claim 18, Dev teaches a method of monitoring alerts regarding the status of components in a computer as in the claims above, including displaying a description of said notification (see fig. 10).

As to claim 20, Dev teaches a method for monitoring the operational status of components in a computer comprising the acts of:

providing a management information base which is configured to associate a plurality of indexes with different operational parameters related to said components (see figs. 1-10; col. 4-7, Dev discloses that the network devices are represented by virtual software models at the management console and event conditions received from the network devices are correlated to the virtual models in the management console).

Generating at least one alert, said alert providing information about a change in an operational parameter in at least one component, said alert comprising one index of said indexes which identifies at least one of said operational parameters (see figs. 1-10; col. 4-7, Dev discloses that the network devices are represented by virtual software models at the management console and event conditions received from the network devices are correlated to the virtual models in the

management console).

Receiving said alert unfiltered from the computer; and transforming said index into an automatically displayed user friendly display message (see figs. 7-10; col. 4-8, Dev discloses that alarm events are received and correlated to the virtual model representing the network devices and displayed to the user using different view options).

As to claims 21-22, Dev teaches a method for monitoring the operational status of components in a computer as in the claim above wherein said index is a variable in said management information base, and wherein said variable is compatible with SNMP (see col. 4).

Claims 23-27, and 33-38 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-18, and 20-22 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

4. Claims 4, 10, 19, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dev et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,751,933 in view of Bonnell et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,655,081.

As to claims 4, 10, 19, and 32, Dev does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of storing at a user computer a recommended course of action associated with one of said alerts, and displaying a recommended course of action associated with said alerts to the user .

However, Boennell teaches a system for monitoring a computer network (see fig. 13; col. 2, and 9, Bonnell discloses a set event manager 52 and event cache 212 responsible for keeping records of various occurrences throughout the computer network, such as occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dev by storing at the user computer recommended resolution of alarm conditions so that alarm conditions are resolved immediately. One would be motivated to do so to allow for management convenience.

5. Claims 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dev in view of Giorgio, U.S. Patent No. 5,761,085.

As per claims 28-31 the rejection of claims 1-27 is fully applied herein. Further, Dev does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation wherein one of said alerts relates to the status of a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply, or a fault isolation unit. However, Giorgio teaches a method for monitoring various parameters such as a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply, or a fault isolation unit for equipment at network sites (see figs. 1-2; col. 4-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Dev in view of Giorgio so that various parameters such as a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply, or a fault isolation unit are monitored. One would be motivated to do so to optimize the working parameters of a network node.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Managing alerts and events in a networked computer system by Cook, U.S. Patent No. 5,621,892.
- Performance monitoring in computer networks by Burgess et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,796,633.
- Monitoring computer system featuring performance data distribution to plural monitoring processes by Takubo et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,961,596.
- Remote monitoring of computer programs by Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,918,004.
- Inter-domain alarm correlation by Lewis, U.S. Patent No. 6,000,045.
- Automatic remote computer monitoring system by Lewis, U.S. Patent No. 6,023,507.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner

Serial No. 08/943,356  
Art Unit 2758

7

can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad Matar, can be reached on (703) 305-4731. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



Saleh Najjar  
Examiner Art Unit 2758